

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the reasons that follow.

Claim 1-4, 8, 14, 16, 19, and 20 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in the application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-4, 8, 12-14, 16-20, and 22-24 are now pending in this application.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8, 12, 14, and 16-20, and 22-24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 as Failing to Comply With the Written Description Requirement

In section 1 of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 12, 14, 16-20, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner stated:

The specification as originally filed does not disclose the recited claim limitations of claims 1 and 14 the last 2 lines “display drivers capable of updating screen resolution and screen display size based on the current expansion of the display screen” and “the processor is configured with display drivers to update display resolution and screen display size based upon the current expansion state of the flexible and expandable display.” The specification as first filed has failed to teach one [of] skill in the art how to make or use the above cited claim limitations

The specification has also failed to disclose the claim limitation of claim 20, the last 4 lines “wherein the first display unit and the second display unit may be interchangeably attached to and detached from the processing unit”. The specification does not teach one [of] skill in the art how to make or use [“]the first display unit and the second display unit may be interchangeably attached to and from the processing unit[”]

With respect to independent claims 1 and 14, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s assertion and point out that originally filed claim 11 (now cancelled) recites “[t]he display system of claim 10, wherein the display system includes drivers capable of

updating screen resolution and screen display size based upon the current expansion of the display screen.” The originally filed claims form a part of the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1: “It is now well settled that a satisfactory description may be in the claims or any other portion of the originally filed specification.” MPEP § 2163(I).

Applicants further reference paragraphs [0029]-[0030] of U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0160771 (Appl. No. 10/085,310; Atty Dkt. No. 035451-0185), which has been incorporated by reference into the present application, and which discloses, among other things, using an identifier pin 160 “to indicate to processing unit 110 the characteristics of the display module. Based upon this information, processing unit 110 can update display driver and/or display controller 118 settings to facilitate communication with visual display unit 150.” (See also FIG. 3). Accordingly, Applicants submit that this disclosure reasonably conveys that Applicants had possession of the above-referenced limitations of claims 1 and 14 at the time the application was filed, as required by the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1.

Further, in response to the Examiner’s statement that “[t]he specification as first filed has failed to teach one [of] skill in the art how to make or use the above cited claim limitations [of claims 1 and 14],” Applicants submit that the above-identified disclosure clearly enables a person of skill in the art to make and use the invention of the present application.

With respect to independent claim 20, Applicants also disagree with the Examiner’s assertion and submit that, as originally filed, claim 20 recited the limitation of “wherein the first display unit and the second display unit may be interchangeably used with the processing unit.” As stated above, originally filed claims form a part of the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1. See MPEP § 2163(I). Applicants submit that the only difference between the current language of claim 20 and the language as originally filed is the amendment from the display units being “interchangeably used” with the processing unit to being “interchangeably attached to and detached from the processing unit.” Further, Applicants submit that the current claim language is clearly supported in the originally filed application. For example, paragraph 0035 of the originally filed application states that “the ability to use

different displays with different properties allows the user to choose a visual display system to meet current requirements.” Further, FIG. 3 clearly illustrates that the displays (e.g., display 310 in a compact state 320) may be attached to or detached from a processing unit or handheld device (e.g., processing unit 120).

Applicants further reference paragraph 0008 of U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0160771 (Appl. No. 10/085,310; Atty Dkt. No. 035451-0185), which has been incorporated by reference into the present application, and which discloses, among other things, “a handheld computing device having a detachable display such that the user can upgrade either a processing unit or display unit . . . [and] a handheld computing device that can be used to recognize and communicate with a plurality of detachable displays.” Accordingly, Applicants submit that this disclosure reasonably conveys that Applicants had possession of the above-referenced limitations of claims 1 and 14 at the time the application was filed, as required by the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1.

Further, in response to the Examiner’s statement that “[t]he specification does not teach one [of] skill in the art how to make or use [‘]the first display unit and the second display unit may be interchangeably attached to and from the processing unit,[’]” Applicants submit that the above-identified disclosure clearly enables a person of skill in the art to make and use the invention of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 14, and 20 comply with the written description requirement and request that the rejection of independent claims 1, 14, and 20, and corresponding depending claims 2-4, 12, 16-19, and 22-24, under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 be withdrawn.

2. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8, 12, 14, and 16-19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Ramakesavan in View of Koenig

In section 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 8, 12, 14, and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan (U.S. Publ. Patent Appl. No. 2003/0065734) in view of Koenig (U.S. Publ. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0021258). For the

reasons that follow, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least one limitation in each of the rejected claims.

Claim 1 is in independent form and has been amended to recite a combination including, among other elements, “wherein the display unit is physically separable from the handheld device while displaying information according to communications from the handheld device between the display unit transceiver and the handheld device transceiver,” which is not taught or suggested by Ramakesavan or Koenig, alone or in any proper combination. Ramakesavan discloses a PDA which may be integrated into a laptop or desktop “computer system.” (¶¶ 0004-0006). In Ramakesavan, when the two units (i.e., the PDA and the computer system) are physically separated, the PDA does not display information received from the computer system. For example, as stated in paragraph 0030, “[w]hen PDA 405 is detached, the selective coupling to interface 440 [to the computer system] decouples.” Further, FIG. 7 illustrates that as a part of the process of the PDA being operated detached from the computer system, the PDA and computer system “synchronize” (step 710), “operate independently” (step 730) once detached, and then “re-synchronize” (step 750) once reattached. Thus, Ramakesavan does not teach or suggest displaying information on a display unit wirelessly received from a handheld device while the display unit is physically separated from the handheld device, as in claim 1. Koenig discloses multiple display screens attached to a handheld device such that the screens may be configured relative to each other so that one or more of the display screens may be viewed simultaneously. (¶ 0031; FIG. 3). However, Koenig does not teach or suggest any desirability of providing a display unit that is physically separable from a handheld device while displaying information wirelessly received from the handheld device, as in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that Ramakesavan and Koenig, alone or in any proper combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of independent claim 1, and corresponding dependent claims 2-4, 8, and 12, be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is in independent form and recites, among other elements, “a wireless transceiver coupled to the handheld device and communicating with the display system transceiver such that the display system is capable of displaying information according to information received from the handheld device via the display system transceiver while the

display system is detached from the handheld device,” which is not taught or suggested by Ramakesavan or Koenig, alone or in any proper combination. As stated above with respect to claim 1, in Ramakesavan, when the two units (i.e., the PDA and the computer system) are physically separated, the PDA does not display information received from the computer system. Likewise, Koenig is directed to multiple display screens attached to a handheld device such that the screens may be configured relative to each other so that one or more of the display screens may be viewed simultaneously. (¶ 0031; FIG. 3). Applicants submit that Applicants submit that Ramakesavan and Koenig, alone or in any proper combination, fail to teach or suggest “a wireless transceiver coupled to the handheld device and communicating with the display system transceiver such that the display system is capable of displaying information according to information received from the handheld device via the display system transceiver while the display system is detached from the handheld device,” as recited in claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of independent claim 14, and corresponding dependent claims 16-19, be withdrawn.

3. Rejection of Claims 20 and 22-24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Ramakesavan in View of Lunsford et al. and Koenig

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan in view of Lunsford et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,350) and Koenig.

Claim 20 recites a combination including, among other elements, “wherein the first display unit and the second display unit [each have a transceiver communicating with the handheld computing device transceiver and] may be interchangeably attached to and detached from the handheld computing device,” which is not taught or suggested by Ramakesavan, Lunsford et al., or Koenig, alone or in any proper combination. Ramakesavan is directed to an integrated computer system where a PDA may be integrated into a computer system such as a laptop or desktop model or, alternatively, used independently. (¶ 0023). Lunsford et al. is directed to a security system for multiple independent computing devices capable of communicating with each other and detecting when one or more of the computing devices leaves a proximity area without authorization. (Col. 4, lines 31-49). Koenig discloses

multiple display screens attached to a handheld device such that the screens may be configured relative to each other so that one or more of the display screens may be viewed simultaneously. (¶ 0031; FIG. 3). None of the cited references teaches or suggests the desirability of having first and second display units that may be interchangeably attached to or detached from a handheld computing device and may display information received from the handheld computing device via wireless communications, as in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Ramakesavan, Lunsford et al., and Koenig, alone or in any proper combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one limitation of independent claim 20. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of independent claim 20, and corresponding dependent claims 22-24, be withdrawn.

4. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extension fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned attorney or agent at the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 12/5/2006

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 319-7306
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Matthew J. Swietlik
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 58,428